

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 3813 OF 2006.

Ramesh Narayan Salunkhe. ... Applicant.
Versus.
The State of Maharashtra. ... Respondent.
Shri Saikumar Pathrudu for the Applicant.
Shri K.V.Saste, A.P.P. for the Respondent.

CORAM : ABHAY S.OKA, J.

DATED : 20th December, 2006.

P.C.:

1. Heard the learned Advocate for the Applicant.
Perused the report submitted by the learned trial Judge.

2. The prayer in this Application is for expediting the trial of a criminal case. The grievance made in the Application is that the trial is pending from the year 1997 and is not making any progress. The report submitted by the learned trial Judge discloses that initially the Applicant applied for discharge, but he did not press the said application. However, the other accused persons have filed applications for discharge which are still pending before the trial Court. An Application was also filed calling upon MHADA to file relevant documents on record. The learned trial Judge has noted that the applications for discharge filed by the other accused were not heard earlier as the Advocates were insisting that before the arguments are heard, MHADA should file certain documents on record.

It is stated in the report that now the documents are filed on record, but the Advocates appearing for the Accused sought time for inspecting the documents. Now the case is adjourned for argument on discharge applications. In the report, the learned Judge has stated that an endeavour will be made to dispose of the discharge applications expeditiously, so that the case can proceed further. The report submitted by the learned trial Judge is accepted. The Report be kept in a sealed envelope. In view of the pendency of the discharge applications, the prayer made in this Application cannot be granted. The Application is rejected.

Judge.